From: thatshortkid18@gmail.com on behalf of Blake Smith <cbsmith7@ncsu.edu>
Sent: Sunday, February 7, 2010 3:45 AM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Subject: Regulation of Retail Forex

I would like to send this email to politely voice my opinion among the thousands of others about the proposed regulation of the Foreign Exchange market on a increase of leverage ratio to 10:1 leverage.

With such a high leverage proposal, me as a college student would have never been able to enter into the retail Forex market. It would have been impossible for me to do so alone, and too much of a risk for my parents to invest in at that rate. Using 100:1 leverage and self-education I was able to invest a small amount of money with minimal risk to myself, and have increased my investment and used that to help pay for college.

Even today, trading on 10:1 leverage does not give me enough of a margin to trade safely, and I will no longer be able to invest the money to pay for college.

Please resconsider this change.

Blake Smith
NC State University
Computer and Electrical Engineering

From: Arthur Brady <arthur.brady@iburst.co.za>
Sent: Sunday, February 7, 2010 4:12 AM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Subject: Regulation of Retail Forex

Dear Secretary,

I Arthur Brady, hereby wish to inform you that I am not in favour of the 10:1 leverage proposal.

Kind regards

Arthur Brady

From: Michael McCulloch <mdmcculloch@comcast.net>
Sent: Sunday, February 7, 2010 7:43 AM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Subject: Regulation of Retail Forex

I am very concerned about the the CFTC attempt to reduce the leverage that retail FOREX traders will be able to use in the United States with regulated FOREX brokers. I oppose this proposed leverage change.

Michael McCulloch
14526 Hillside Hickory Ct

Houston, TX 77062

832.453.7139 (M)
mdmcculloch@comcast.net

From: Angel Julio Pena Veras <jpveras@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 7, 2010 9:25 AM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Subject: Regulation of Retail Forex

THIS IS JUST UNACEPTABLE!!! BETTER GO TO UK OR ASIA FOR TRADING.
BYE BYE AMERICA!

--

Angel Julio Peña
La Romana R.D.
jpveras@gmail.com

From: sueboi boi <wufgangstas@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 7, 2010 9:46 AM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Subject: 'Regulation of Retail Forex'

I'm a novice trader and I believe that changing the leverage amounts "again" would destroy the U.S. retail forex market and that's falls into the category of a weaker U.S economy. Small voices can't always be heard but the more voices the louder the echo ID number **RIN 3038-AC61** .

P.S. I hope I made my point in this short letter to you guys behind the big desks to please take it easy on us little people and leave the leverage amounts alone.

Regards,
ID number **RIN 3038-AC61**

From: Michael Serpico <mjserpico@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 7, 2010 9:46 AM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Subject: Industry Filings: Comments on Industry Submissions: Regulation of Retail Forex
Attach: RIN 3038-AC61 comments.docx

Dear Secretary,

My comments on **RIN 3038-AC61** are provided in the attached document. In summary, I urge you to abandon the proposal to limit forex leverage on the grounds that it will limit people from a legitimate source of self employment and strip students of the market of a way to learn about trading from a hands on approach.

Thank you for your time,
Michael Serpico

1801 Buttonwood St. Apt 217
Philadelphia, PA 19130
2/6/2010

David Stawick, Secretary
Commodity Futures Trading Commission
1155 21st Street, N.W.,
Washington, DC 20581

Dear Mr. Stawick,

Please consider abandoning the proposal to limit retail forex leverage to 10:1. The forex market provides individuals with an entrepreneurial opportunity to support themselves and provides an avenue for individuals to learn about the derivatives markets' nature, risks, and operations. By limiting the leverage to 10:1, many otherwise smart, calculating and prudent individuals will be unable to gain the educational and financial benefits the forex market can provide. The rule could then ultimately lead to a marginal increase in the general population's ignorance of the marketplace and unemployment via former participants' inability to trade.

The retail forex market allows many skilled individuals with the ability to become confident self-employed workers or at least provide them with supplemental income. By increasing leverage requirements, participants' equity accounts will be unable to support the same number of contracts per trade. They will either have to abandon their source of income or trade without proper risk –reward ratios in an attempt to match the income they were generating when their accounts could support multiples contracts. This will lead to participants risking more money than is prudent or forcing customers to look elsewhere for the ability to trade.

The forex market also allows young, budding students of the market to get a hand on approach to understanding how the market works while only risking limited amounts of capital. Concepts, like leverage, slippage, bid-ask spread and many others will only be fully understood through genuine experience and sometimes financial loss. These experiences make the participants more knowledgeable and ultimately better off to pursue careers in the finance sector and keep a keener eye on their personal finances. Participants who do not heed these lessons and choose to risk more money are doing nothing more than gambling and will squander their money elsewhere regardless of the leverage requirements imposed.

Once again, I urge you not to pass a proposal limiting the leverage of retail forex transactions. This proposal will do little to stop the reckless participants squandering money and only hurt the smart, knowledgeable traders that have done nothing wrong.

Thank you,
Michael Serpico

From: Ali Hayawi <alihayawi2003@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 7, 2010 10:00 AM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Subject: Regulation

Hi,
I think such proposed regulation will damage Forex industry completely in USA and most of forex traders(including me) will transfer their investment to UK and Swiss.There is one fact you should think about it before implementing such regulation that the forex trader take the high risk associated with forex trading just because its high leverage.So if you put such limitations in the leverage why I should continue in forex trading and not go to less risky tools trading tools with leverage not too much different from forex.

Thank you.

Ali Hayawi
FXCM customer

From: Bruce Abeel <bruce.abeel@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 7, 2010 10:13 AM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Subject: Regulation of Retail Forex

Dear Secretary of the Commission,

I am writing to you regarding both my concern and disapproval of the proposed reduction of leverage on forex accounts to 10:1 contained in the "Regulation of Off-Exchange Retail Foreign Exchange Transactions and Intermediaries" dated January 20, 2010.

As a small retail trader I have found forex trading very enjoyable and maintain several small accounts. I feel that this proposal is targeted at the small retail investor and if passed will effectively deny me and many other retail traders from being able to trade in the forex market. I sincerely hope that the proposal for reducing the leverage on forex accounts is not passed

Thanks for taking the time to read this email.

Best regards,

Bruce H. Abeel

From: Jeff King <jeff@guerrillagames.net>
Sent: Sunday, February 7, 2010 11:00 AM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Subject: Regulation of Retail Forex

Mr. David Stawick
Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission
1155 21st Street NW
Washington, DC 20581

RE: RIN 3038-AC61

Dear Mr. Stawick:

Please register my opposition to the CFTC proposal of a 1:10 leverage for retail Forex trading.

The Forex market's First Rule of Risk is that a trader should never trade with any more capital investment than he/she can afford to lose.

The CFTC proposed leverage revision from 1:100 to 1:10 would increase the amount of my capital

investment by 10 times, a 1000% increase in risk exposure.

The basis for my opposition to the proposal is that it flagrantly disregards the Forex market's First Rule of Risk.

I will go overseas if this proposal is passed and so will about 90% of forex traders. The US wil suffer.

Jeff King
Roselle IL, 60172
jeff@guerrillagames.net

From: Richard Garcia <mercuryhvac@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 7, 2010 1:26 PM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Subject: Regulation of Retail Forex

I would like to express my opposition to the proposed rule changes concerning leverage from 100 to 1 to 10 to 1. I feel the new rules will restrict my ability as a small investor.

Thank you,

Richard Garcia

From: hogan5 <hogan5@optonline.net>
Sent: Sunday, February 7, 2010 1:53 PM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Subject: Proposed Forex Regulations

I agree with regulating the Forex industry and registering brokers, but I STRONGLY disagree with a 10-1 leverage restriction. It's too low.
I would likely trade overseas. This would leave me without the protection you intend to put in place, which I do want.

I prefer a leverage ratio of 100-1.
I believe that newer traders would be protected at this rate and can still use the option of mini- or micro-lots.
But a 10-1 ratio for mini- or micro-lots make no sense.

Please consider this and enact 100-1 leverage instead.
Thank you.

From: raw_ljw <wink823@att.net>
Sent: Sunday, February 7, 2010 1:56 PM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Subject: Re: "Regulation of Retail Forex" - Identification number RIN 3038-AC61
Attach: CFTC Ltr_01-22-10.pdf

David A. Stawick
Secretary
Commodity Futures Trading Commission
1155 21st Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20581

Dear Mr. Stawick,

I have attached a letter regarding the above subject.

Respectfully,
Rance Winkler

January 23, 2010

Via Electronic Mail: secretary@cftc.gov

David A. Stawick
Secretary
Commodity Futures Trading Commission
1155 21st Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20581

Re: "Regulation of Retail Forex" - Identification number RIN 3038-AC61

Dear Mr. Stawick:

I am writing to you (CFTC) to record my protest over the referenced rule proposal. I believe that the traders' community, as a whole is joining hands to show our concerns and request that you vote down this vicious rule proposal by CFTC.

Summary

Basically, if implemented, the proposed changes could have the opposite effect from what the CFTC is trying to achieve. All you do is drive legitimate traders like me off shore, and what you still have left in the U.S. are the fraudulent dealers who don't operate within the law anyway. It will cost US jobs, US tax revenue, and more traders will get ripped off by brokers outside of US jurisdiction where there is less regulation, so it does more harm than good!

In my opinion, the cure is EDUCATION, not restricting what people can and cannot do with their investment decisions. As with any investment strategy, you are responsible for what you do with your money and that includes investigating those you will have to ultimately partner with and trust in the process. Government was invented to protect people and their property, not to limit their potential! This is a classic example of government over regulation. The United States of America is the land of the free, where each forex trader should be able to make their own EDUCATED decisions about their money.

Background

I believe it is important to give some context to the situation we are currently in here, but the history of regulation in the U.S. foreign exchange market is a long and complex one, so I will be brief. In 2004 the federal court in the U.S. ruled that the CFTC (Commodity Trading Futures Commission) could not target fraud cases in the OTC forex markets because they were outside its remit. Then in 2008 the U.S. Congress passed legislation that returned regulatory authority of the forex markets back to the CFTC after a flood of cases involving fraudulent foreign exchange dealers targeting retail investors.

That's when the NFA (National Futures Association) came into being. Andrei Pehar, Chief Currency Strategist at fxKnight.com says "What happens is the NFA suggests these rules, and the CFTC accepts and enacts them (the CFTC fully admits forex is not their area of expertise, which is why they originally empowered the NFA to take this area over). The problem is that the NFA is NOT a consumer protection agency. They are a trade organization made up of, funded by, and created to further the interests of… futures brokers - National Futures Association. And there's no denying that retail forex competes directly with their members' business interests... It gets worse! Starting April 1st, the NFA intends to try and start legislating across borders, by forcing offshore brokers and IBs to register with them as well.

Discussion

To achieve regulation and crack down on the tremendous amount of scams, the CFTC wants to include the ruling passed by the NFA last year that all foreign exchange dealers are registered with a regulator. This has been welcomed by dealers, so too has the proposal to impose a minimum capital requirement of $20 million dollars in order to be a registered broker in the U.S. which acts as a capital cushion to protect consumers and is an important step towards regulating the industry. Also in November of last year the NFA already reduced the leverage ratio for foreign exchange trades from 400:1 to 100:1. But now the proposal to slash the amount of leverage from 100:1 to 10:1 has unleashed an outcry from brokers and dealers alike.

This new CFTC ruling, if enacted, would mean that a client would need to increase the amount of money they post in a security deposit account held with their dealer to 10 percent of the value of each trade from the current level of about one percent. This would mean that for every $10 you want to trade on foreign exchange you have to post $1 as a security. This move was unexpected because leverage limits were dramatically reduced six months ago by the NFA, the CFTC's voice to the forex industry in the U.S..

On January 20th, an FXCM client wrote: FXCM sent a letter out to all their clients actually stating they oppose this and asking them to write to the CTFC. I'm amazed… I've heard individual people who work there grumble about the rules (off the record), but I have never seen a big company like this take such a public stance on an issue.

I'm still waiting on FXDD to do the same, especially since just 2 months ago they received their licensing with the NFA. Must be great to get a license with the same group that's going to put you out of business in just a few more months!

Conclusion

The Foreign Exchange Dealers Coalition (FXDC), which is made up of nine major firms, is working on a unified response to the CFTC's proposals. The coalition is trying to ensure a balance between protecting the consumer whilst not stifling business. The FXDC affirms on its statement that the U.S. $1 billion industry is in danger if CFTC proposal passes. "This revenue is money generated from a product that is in many ways an export. Furthermore, as capital markets open in the BRIC countries the number of new accounts that will flow out of places like China and India will lead to huge job and revenue gains in the United States." ***The Foreign Exchange Dealers Coalition says - "Trillions of dollars of trade volume are at stake. This is money that could (and should) be booked in the United States as taxable revenue. But if this rule passes the United States could well be costing itself billions of dollars in taxes down the road."***

Excerpt from an FXDC letter last week:

"The case against the 10 to 1 leverage rule is clear. The rule will be a boon to foreign forex dealers (both regulated and unregulated) who will grow entirely at the expense of retail forex dealers in the United States. Thousands of high paying jobs will be lost and the potential for tens of thousands of more jobs will forever vanish as well. Consumers will be hurt and more vulnerable to fraud. And the United States will toss away one of the most promising export industries that it has, all in the midst of 10% unemployment. There is no good reason that this should be so."

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Rance A. Winkler

Rance A. Winkler

From: Zhenyu Li <zhenyuli88@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 7, 2010 3:09 PM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Subject: Regulation of Retail Forex

HI,

By my experience, leverage 70:1 is reasonable.

200:1 looks too risky for Forex Trader.

Rgds

Gerald

From: William Draper <william_draper01@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 7, 2010 3:20 PM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Subject: Regulation of Retail Forex

First I would like to say that I understand the need for regulation of retail forex and I welcome it. I appreciate the CFTC having my wellbeing in mind; however, lowering available leverage to 10:1 will do nothing to protect me from possible unscrupulous business practices. In fact such a move will eliminate my ability to trade all together. I simply do not have the large account size that I feel would be necessary to trade at this level safely and successfully.

I have spent 3 years studying markets developing my skills understanding that there are risks involved and I place my positions accordingly. I treat my trading as a business something that all successful, learned traders do. I take businessmen risks not risky gambles.

I must stress that with proper understanding of money management and knowing ones risk before entering a trade, the current NFA level of 100:1 can be traded safely.
If a trader exhausts their capital by taking unwarranted, risky positions with little to no logical thought, they have only themselves to blame. There are numerous available resources with which a trader may learn the proper money management techniques so as to preserve their equity and create a steady, growing equity curve.

Finally, trading in any market, including retail forex, is not for everyone. Some people will try and fail. Perhaps they do not treat trading as a business, perhaps they do not devote the appropriate time to learning what it takes to be successful, in any case there are those of us that do and have. All we ask is to have the ability to continue to do so.

Thank you for your time!

William Draper

From: FredFields123@aol.com
Sent: Sunday, February 7, 2010 3:47 PM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Subject: A Disabled American Veteran's Opposition to reducing retail FX leverage

Dear Sirs,

It is with a heavy heart that I write to you today as your proposal to reduce retail forex margin to 10:1 would adversely impact the livelihoods of millions of disabled Americans. Each year more and more disabled Americans and their families rely on online trading and more importantly online retail forex to support themselves and their families.

As for myself, since suffering a permanent disability in 2004, I struggled to find ways to support myself and my family. Disability benefits alone paid far too little as I was forced into bankruptcy due to the unexpected disability. After attempting several unsuccessful online business opportunities, I was eventually introduced to retail forex through a TV add on MSNBC.

I purchased and read books on technical analysis of the financial markets and sought all available information so as to learn the skills necessary to trade with consistent profits. I trade my personal forex account utilizing a 100:1 margin and have been doing so successfully since April 2006.

The monthly income that I have consistently earned from my trading has allowed me and my family to reacquire the standard of living that we had before my disability. Furthermore, my 2008 and 2009 earnings have exceeded my pre-disability earnings so that I no longer require disability payments.

If your proposal to reduce margin to 10:1 were to become law, I would no longer be able to support my family with my current trading resources.

Shame, shame on you and your colleges should you decide to implement this far over-reaching restriction on retail forex.

Regards,

Fred Fields

From: Prem Krishna <premkgowda@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 7, 2010 4:03 PM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Subject: Regulation of Retail Forex

I am writing with regards to proposed regulation to restrict the leverage to 1:10 in Forex Futures. Lot of traders who cann't afford large capital wouldn't be able to trade with this rules. It will also impact the small traders negatively as it may resulting in people borrowing money just to meet the margin requirement. I would really appreciate it if you can reconsider this rule.

Thanks,

From: jnovak@softlinkdev.com
Sent: Sunday, February 7, 2010 4:42 PM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Subject: Proposed change in Leverage Rules

Dear Sir;

It has come to my attention that a proposal is being made to restrict or reduce the amount of leverage available to forex traders in the currency market. I have been trading now for about seven years and see absolutely no reason for such a change.

If people cannot handle the risks involved in using leverage appropriately, they should not be trading to begin with. If you examine the current state of our countries finances I think it is quite obvious that we need LESS involvement by the Feds than more.

Leverage (as it stands today) allows the "little guy" to succeed in the trading business. Let's keep the Government out of it. I'll say it one more time, we are not children who need a nanny watching over our every move. As long as the market is fair to everyone, there is no collusion or misrepresentation, leave it alone.

Respectfully,

Judd Novak

From: Dennis Davidson <davidson368054@bellsouth.net>
Sent: Sunday, February 7, 2010 6:12 PM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Cc: Steve Kinnaman <skinnaman@triad.rr.com>
Subject: Regulation of retail forex

Dear Secretary

I am a Forex trader and I am using it to supplement my retirement. Please do not take away the 100% leverage. You will be taking away the income of a lot of people that are now trading the forex because it is an area that you can start trading with as little as $400.00 and grow it into a good income. It would be a big mistake for the U.S. to change the leverage to 10%. This would force people to seek accounts overseas and the USA would loose a lot tax dollars. I am available to discuss this issue with anyone that thinks they need to change this leverage. Please see my phone numbers below. I hear that one of the reasons for the change is to protect people from loosing money. I say to you that those people will find another way to loose their money you would not be protecting anyone. But if that is the reason for change I would say to you do away with the lottery and gambling. Before you take this action you need to figure out where those lost tax dollars will come from. Please do not do this disservice to the American traders.

Thank you for hearing me.

Dennis Davidson
240 Bonaventure Drive
Salisbury NC 28147
Home Phone: 704.210.8132
Cell Phone: 704.267.6091
E-mail address davidson368054@bellsouth.net

From: Kevin Rosenberger <krosenbo@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 7, 2010 6:15 PM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Subject: regulation

to the secretary

I don't what your trying to accomplish in the forex market by limiting margin to 10 to 1. You'll find the people (serious investors) our seriously adamant against it. It won't add to the efficiency of capital markets. Why don't stick your nose elsewhere! I can't say it in a nicer way. I'm sorry.

Kevin Rosenberger

From: jmcmi24918@aol.com
Sent: Sunday, February 7, 2010 6:42 PM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Subject: Regulation of Retail Forex

Dear Secretary,

I write this email to you to express my opposition to the proposed 10:1 leverage limit on retail forex trades within the
United States. As a trader , I am of course concerned about unscrupulous brokers misleading persons who shouldn't be trading in the forex market.
I do in fact support increased capital requirements for retail forex firms and vigorous prosecution of fraudulent brokers. However, as a trader
who understands and accepts the risks involved in forex trading I feel the proposed leverage restriction denies me an important financial
tool which I understand and employ. I should also like to point out the proposed leverage limit isn't being applied to the futures market, which
the CFTC regulates. Currency futures contracts (as of this time) are being traded at 30:1 leverage at the CME.

The proposed leverage limit also will most likely result in honest forex firms leaving the United States. Your agency should not be involved
in eliminating American jobs, especially during an economic recession. Furthermore, the proposed regulation will not prevent traders such as myself
from using high leverage; we will simply open accounts with foreign firms. I certainly do not want that to happen and would prefer doing business with an
American company if possible.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,
Dr. Jack McMillan
Honolulu, Hi

From: Magan Pansuriya <magan44@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 7, 2010 8:39 PM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Subject: Regulation of Retail Forex

Dear secretary
Please vote against increased regulation and decreased leverage
Thank you

Magan Pansuriya MD

From: 3zs@sohu.com
Sent: Sunday, February 7, 2010 9:50 PM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Subject: Regulation of Retail Forex

To whom it may concern:

I am a forex trader in China and I have been using US brokers for several years and very satisfied. Compared with other countries brokers, the aspects of US counterparties appealing me, which I think apply to other countries clients also, are:

1, Strong and respectable regulation bodies,
2, Sound and sophisticated financial infrastructure,
3, US as a country have a tradtion for the protection of international investors,
4, US based forex firms are generaly more financially solid and well-managed.

Regarding your recently regulation proposal, I fully agree to enhance industry oversight, but I don''t like put any restrictions on leverage. Leverage is a very important tool for us seeking financial freedom as your Amercian, and lowering leverage dramatically like this will not only hurt our clients feeling but also drive us to other countries (ie. unregulated) brokers despite above advantage. This is not a win-win situation, it''s a lose-lose situation that you probably wouldn''t expected.

I think 1:100 is very good .

Please reconsider your proposal.Regards,

zhengsai

From: idajcousin <idajcousin@bellsouth.net>
Sent: Sunday, February 7, 2010 10:43 PM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Subject: Regulation of Retail

Hello,

Once again, the only traders that can trade in the forex market will be the Banks and the Rich.

Thanks,

From: Daniel W Mueller <aucdan@juno.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 4, 2010 3:07 PM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Subject: Regulation of Retail Forex

It would be crazy to go to 10-1 leverage. Forex players are a different breed of players. This would really ruin it for thousands of players. Try to understand the nature of forex before making a wrong call.